



highlighted.

This outcome shocked and appalled Richard. He argued—plausibly or not no-one else can now know—that he had not been given sufficiently explicit warnings by his supervisor about the problems that his thesis had apparently had. He also argued that the supervision had been inadequate both in quantity (on which one suspects that he may well have had a point) and in quality (about which it is impossible for me to make judgments). He made these observations in a formal complaint to the (now different) Head of School and then to the University.

At the resulting tribunal Gerry's conduct was only partially exonerated. Rather to the surprise of some of his friends and colleagues, he had elected not to make an issue of his own reluctance to acquiesce in the student's original admission (of which, it should be noted, the complainant himself had never been aware). He reasoned that he could not document precisely the process by which his own academic judgments had been over-ruled by senior staff. He also feared that drawing attention to the unpropitious beginnings of their relationship might in any case make him look like he had always harboured unfair prejudices against the student.

The outcome, mainly based on the institution accepting that the supervision provided could not be shown to have been sufficiently diligent and robust, was that the student was permitted to re-submit the thesis in substantially different form. Another colleague in the Department was persuaded, very reluctantly, to act as the new supervisor. Richard, whose stridency and belligerence are undiminished, continues to talk provocatively of possible legal action against the original supervisor.

I am now awaiting further developments with some apprehension. Have you any suggestions?

Many thanks in anticipation.

Derek